

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	Page 1 of 9
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 04/30/2004	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. FIN0400013	5. PROJECT NO. <i>(If applicable)</i>		
6. ISSUED BY AO801 Office of Procurement 359 Ford HOB Washington, DC 20515		CODE AO801	7. ADMINISTERED BY <i>(If other than Item 6)</i> CODE		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR <i>(No., street, county, State and Zip Code)</i>			(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. OPR04000432	
			(X)	9B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 11)</i> 04/19/2004	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 13)</i>	
CODE			FACILITY CODE		

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☒ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.

IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14.
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER <i>(Specify type of modification and authority)</i>

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

- a. To respond to vendor questions, provide revisions to solicitation and revised attachments, and extend date of closing from May 17, 2004, to Monday, May 24, 2004.
- b. Request that vendors make the following Pen and Ink change to section E.2, Failure to Perform. Under item a. change reference "HC.6.016" to read "HC.6.009".
- c. Attachment 1, Detailed Statement of Work_v2 replaces in its entirety the original Attachment 1. Changes are indicated by left side border line indicators.
- d. Attachment 2, Compaliance Matrix_v2 replaces in its entirety the original Attachemnt 2. 8 new requirements have been added, 4 in contracts and 4 in purchasing.
- e. Attachment 5, System Development Life Cycle Policy (3/24/99) has been added.
- f. Clasue L.1, HC.12.003, Submissions, added that proposals are to be sent via email to edwin.davis@mail.house.gov.
- g. All other terms and condition remain unchanged.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER <i>(Type or print)</i>		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER <i>(Type or print)</i> William L. Dellar	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR <i>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</i>	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY _____ <i>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</i>	16C. DATE SIGNED

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 3 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A -- Solicitation/Contract Form	4
A.1 Summary of Changes	4
SECTION F -- Deliveries or Performance	5
F.1 Payment for Non-Performance	5
SECTION J -- List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments	6
J.1 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	6
SECTION L -- Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Bidders	7
L.1 Submissions	7
SECTION M -- Evaluation Factors for Award	8
M.1 Contract Award	8
M.2 Evaluation Factors for Award	8

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 4 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

SECTION A -- SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

A.1 SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Clause 'HC.6.009 - Payment for Non-Performance' has been added.
 The free form item 'LIST OF ATTACHMENTS' has been edited.
 Clause 'HC.12.003 - Submissions' has been edited.
 Clause 'HC.13.001 - Evaluation Factors for Award' has been edited.
 Clause 'HC.13.002 - Contract Award' has been edited.

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 5 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

SECTION F -- DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

F.1 HC.6.009 PAYMENT FOR NON-PERFORMANCE

SEPTEMBER 2001

In the event that the contractor fails to perform as stipulated in the statement of work, and such failure is not for a reason beyond the control of the contractor, the House may charge 1% of the total contract cost per day and may obtain performance from another source and charge and collect all costs plus a 15% administrative fee from the contractor.

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 6 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

SECTION J -- LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS

J.1 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Detailed Statement of Work_v2	67 pages
Attachment 2	Compliance Matrix _v2	95 pages
Attachment 3	FSR System Requirements Specification Version 2.1 of December 15, 2003	45 Pages
Attachment 4	Affirmation of Non-Disclosure	1 Page
Attachment 5	System Development Life Cycle Policy (3/24/99)	32 Pages

All attachments may be downloaded from Office of Procurement web site

<http://www.house.gov/cao-opp/currentsol.htm>

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 7 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

SECTION L -- INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

L.1 HC.12.003 SUBMISSIONS

MARCH 2004

Offerors shall submit one electronic version in Microsoft Word and Excel format, compatible to no greater than Microsoft Office 2000. Each portion of the response should be consistent with the instructions noted in each section of the solicitation and detailed statement of work. The potential offeror must provide a written response to this solicitation using the Table of Contents outlined in Appendix 9.1. See Section J Attachment 1 Detailed Statement of Work. Proposals shall be emailed to lawrence.toferoff@mail.house.gov and edwin.davis@mail.house.gov. Facsimile proposals will NOT be accepted.

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 8 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

SECTION M -- EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 HC.13.002 CONTRACT AWARD

JULY 2001

a. The House intends to award a single contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to this solicitation, taking into account the factors contained in M.1 "Evaluation Factors for Award".

b. The House may:

- (1) reject any or all offers, if such action is in its interest,
- (2) waive informalities and minor irregularities in offers received.

M.2 HC.13.001 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

JULY 2001

The House intends to make a single award to offeror whose proposal meets the minimum requirements as stated in this RFP.

The House will conduct a review of written proposals. Those Potential Offerors proposals identified by the House as best meeting the needs of the House will then be asked to conduct an oral presentation detailing their proposed solution. Evaluation criteria for both written and oral presentations are the following:

- o Qualifications of Potential Offeror's key personnel and personnel approach. This includes expertise in Federal sector financials, experience in implementation of proposed software solution, and experience using the proposed implementation method and approach.
- o Past performance and references
- o The ability of the Potential Offeror's solution to meet the House's functional requirements
- o The ability of the Potential Offeror's solution to meet the House's system requirements
- o Potential Offeror's familiarity with the Federal sector and the House environment
- o Potential Offeror's management approach. This includes the approach to program and project management, risk management, and change management as well as access to senior management.
- o Potential Offeror's corporate capabilities. This includes the Potential Offeror's long-term viability, experience in Federal financials and proposed software, and organizational strength and weaknesses.
- o Potential Offeror's technical approach. This includes proposed tool and methods as well as the proposed approach to integration, extensions/customizations, transition to sustainment, and training.
- o Potential Offeror's cost proposal

Those selected to participate in the oral presentations will be notified as to when they will participate. The dates of these oral presentations will be randomly selected and no exceptions to the schedule will be permitted. These oral presentations will take place at the Washington, D.C. Capitol Hill Campus.

The intent of the oral presentations is to have the Potential Offerors feature key elements of their solution and why it would provide the best overall value to the House.

The following instructions are intended for those who will participate and are considered complete.

- o Each presentation will be 4 hours.
- o Each presentation will be split into two sessions
- o Each session will be two hours, consisting of a one hour presentation and a one hour question and answer period
- o Session one will focus on program management and the House environment
- o For session one the Potential Offeror is only allowed to have the following participants
- o Project Manager
- o Change Management Lead
- o Functional Lead
- o Participant of choice
- o Session two will focus on implementation of the system (functionally and technically)

Solicitation Amendment	Document No. OPR04000432/0001	Document Title FSR Systems Integration Services	Page 9 of 9
-----------------------------------	---	---	-------------

- o For session two the Potential Offeror is only allowed to have the following participants
- o Project Manager
- o Functional Lead
- o Technical Lead
- o Participant of choice
- o The presentation must be conducted so an audience of 20-30 people may participate.
- o The presentation must be in electronic and paper format.
- o The intent is to have a presentation displayed from a PC/Laptop through a LCD Projector.

**House of Representatives FSR Systems Integration Services
Solicitation OPR04000432
Responses to vendor questions**

QUESTION 1

Reference: RFP Section L.2 *Submission*, Page 26.

RFP states that the Government desires one electronic version of the proposal submitted in Microsoft Word and Excel formats. Offerors will utilize different style templates in our responses that may effect the presentation of our proposal for Government review.

Would the Government also accept a PDF formatted version of our response (that would maintain style templates) in addition to the Microsoft Word and Excel formats. Please advise.

RESPONSE - Yes. However, compliance matrix must be returned in Excel format, Office 2000 version.

QUESTION 2

Respectfully request that the Government provide the FSR Systems Integration Services Compliance Matrix in Microsoft Excel format to potential bidders.

RESPONSE - Yes. This amendment includes a revised Compliance Matrix v2 and will be posted in Excel format for potential bidders use.

QUESTION 3

Reference: Attachment 4, Compliance Matrix

The US House is requiring submission in electronic format. Can the compliance matrix be provided in Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel?

RESPONSE – Excel Only. See response to Question 2 above.

QUESTION 4

Reference: Section L2

Since the House is requiring that responses be submitted in Microsoft Word or Excel format, can the House make the solicitation available in Word or Excel format so offerors do not have to retype the solicitation. If the House does not wish to make the entire solicitation available in electronic format can those portions that have to be electronically submitted be available (Solicitation – Section K, Attachment 1 – Tables and other required forms, Attachment 2 – Entire spreadsheet)

RESPONSE - Solicitation – Section K - No, Attachment 1 – Tables and other required forms – Yes, and Attachment 2 – Entire Spreadsheet – Yes. See response to question 2 above.

QUESTION 5

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 9.1, RFP Response Table of Contents-Format (Corporate Experience/Implementation Team)

For the referenced response sections, the desired format is designated as being a Table; however, RFP Attachment 1, Section 7.1.6 requires that Potential Offerors “describe the proposed implementation team, including their private and Federal sector experience relevant to the selected software.” Similarly, in Attachment 1, Section 8.1, the Potential Offeror “must describe all aspects of their Customer Care program...specific organization, account teams, and house-specific process and procedures must be described...the automated trouble tracking system must be described in terms of a process flow diagram that highlights the following key steps: trouble input; trouble registration; trouble analysis; trouble resolution; and trouble log-out.” Such discussions would be independent of the Tables provided in the RFP. Could the House please confirm that it is acceptable to provide a narrative response to these requirements in addition to providing the information required in the Table format?

RESPONSE - Amendment 0001 replaces Attachment 1, Detailed Statement of Work in its entirety with v2. Please read Section 9.1 of revised Attachment 1 and other changed sections.

QUESTION 6

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 9.1, RFP Response Table of Contents-Format and RFP Attachment 1, Section 8.

There appears to be a discrepancy between the information requested in RFP Attachment 1, Section 9.1 and that which is required in RFP Attachment 1, Section 8. Specifically, on p. 56 in RFP Section 9.1, under "Customer Care," the only sections to be addressed are RFP Attachment 1 Sections 8.1, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.3.2, and 8.4; however, RFP Attachment 1 Sections 8.3.1, Roles and Responsibilities, states that the "Potential Offeror must describe the roles and responsibilities of the assigned Customer Care Team consistent with the proposed Customer Care process. The description of the roles and responsibilities must be illustrated with an organization chart that facilitates the depiction of the proposed Customer Care team with their client counterparts (staff of the House)." Could the House please confirm that it is acceptable to include a narrative response to this requirement?

RESPONSE - See response to question 5 above.

QUESTION 7

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 7.1.6; RFP Attachment 1, Section 8.1.

Could the House modify the Table of Contents to include the requirements detailed in RFP Attachment 1, Sections 7.1.6 and 8.1?

RESPONSE - Yes. Amendment 0001 replaces Attachment 1, Detailed Statement of Work in its entirety with v2.

QUESTION 8

Reference: Section 9.1 Table of Contents, Section 7

Can the House please review and provide an update to Section 9.1? Additionally, 9.1 shows section 7.3.6 as Technical Solution but this is not included in Section 7.

RESPONSE - See response to question 5 above.

QUESTION 9

Please confirm the page limits in Section 9.1. There are discrepancies from the text descriptions for these sections. For example, what is the page limit for the change management plan? Section 9.1 says 1000 words, but the text description, (Section 7.2.3) says 2000 words.

RESPONSE - Word count limits are now defined only in the table of contents of Attachment 1, Detailed Statement of Work v2. See Amendment 0001 for revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 10

Reference: Section 9.1 – "Integration Deliverables"

According to section 7.3 this section requires a detailed description of all deliverables and mapping to the House SDLC. Is there any word limit for this section?

RESPONSE - Yes. Please refer to Section 9.1 of revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 11

Reference: Section 7.1.2

Should the reference to the financial information section be Section K, rather than Section L?

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 12

Reference: Section 9.1 – "Instance Strategy"

The format requested is a "Table", however there is no desired format for the table indicated in Section 7.3.4. Can the House please clarify what is desired?

RESPONSE – See response to question 5 above.

QUESTION 13

Reference: Section 9.1 – “Instance Strategy”

Instructs Offeror to reference section 7.3.4 for the Instance Strategy section of the response and respond in table form. Is there a suggested format for the table response or is this up to the Offeror?

RESPONSE - See response to question 5 above.

QUESTION 14

Reference: pg 48 7.3.11 Documentation

Please provide directions on how to complete the “Resource Requirements by House Column of this documentation table

RESPONSE - Amendment 0001 deletes this section in revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 15

Reference: Section 9.1 – Integration Deliverables

There is a “Technical Solution” category, though section 7.3.6 is really “Conversion”. Similarly, the remaining items are mismatched. Is there a “Technical Solution” section missing from the document?

RESPONSE - Amendment 0001 corrects this discrepancy. Please see revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 16

Reference: Section 7.2

Section does not contain formatting or a word count restriction. Section 7.2.1 contains a word count restriction of 2000 words. Section 9.1, TOC, assigns a 1000 word count restriction to both sections. Should the Offeror follow instructions in section 7 or section 9.1?

RESPONSE – See response to question 9 above.

QUESTION 17

Reference: Section 7.3

Section instructs Offeror to describe all deliverables, but does not contain formatting or word count restrictions. Are there format or word count restrictions for this section?

RESPONSE - See response to question 9 above.

QUESTION 18

Reference: Table of Contents

Could the House modify the Table of Contents to include the requirements detailed in RFP Attachment 1, Sections 7.1.6 and 8.1?

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 19

Reference: Section 7.3.6 in Table of Contents

Instructs Offeror to reference section 7.3.6 for the Technical Solution section of the response. 7.3.6 references Conversion. Should the Offeror still include a Technical Solution between Prototypes and Conversion? If so, are there guidelines or word count restrictions?

RESPONSE - See revised Attachment 1 in Amendment 0001.

QUESTION 20

Reference: For an Offeror who will be teaming with another firm, how would the House like to see the Corporate Profiles tables illustrated? Could we show additional columns for each firm within the team?

RESPONSE - See revised Attachment 1, Section 7.1 in Amendment 0001.

QUESTION 21

Reference: RFP Appendix, Pg 52, Customer Care
Identifies levels 1, 2, and 3 of customer care. Can the government please define the scope of support expected at each customer care level?

RESPONSE - No. Offeror must propose support model in response to solicitation. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1, Section 2.2.7 for current House support environment.

QUESTION 22

Reference: RFP Appendix, Pg 52, Customer Care
Identifies levels 1,2,3 of customer care. Can the government please define the scope of support expected at each customer care level?

RESPONSE - See response to question 21 above.

QUESTION 23

Reference: RFP Appendix, Pg 52, Customer Care
Identifies levels 1, 2, 3 of customer care. Can the government please define the scope of support expected at each customer care level?

RESPONSE - See response to question 21 above.

QUESTION 24

Reference: RFP Appendix 1, Page 52, Section 8. Customer Care
Question: Appendix identifies Levels 1, 2, and 3 of customer care. Please define the type of support that the Government expects to receive at each level. For example, does the Government expect an on-site help desk at the Ford House Office Building or other facilities? Does the Government expect support beyond a typical 7AM-7PM timeframe? Does the Government anticipate an 800 call in number to support users off-site or on travel? Please clarify your expectations

RESPONSE - See response to question 21 above for scope of support. Offeror must propose respective solution.

QUESTION 25

Reference: RFP Section L.2 *Submission*, Page 26.

RFP states that the Government desires one electronic version of the proposal submitted. Is there a size limitation for attachments within the House's email application? Please advise.

RESPONSE - Yes, 15 Mb, and vendors are encouraged to transmit large files in zipped format self extracting.

QUESTION 26

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 2.2.4 *Function to System Mapping Table* and RFP Attachment 1, Section 3.2 *Phased Approach Using Contract Line Item Numbers*.

Referenced tables present different CLIN structures. Please clarify which CLIN structure should be used for pricing.

RESPONSE - The CLIN structure is revised in Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 27

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 6.1 *Performance Expectations*, Page 32.

RFP identifies tasking to "...identify, evaluate, and verify the system performance of the targeted versus current environments." This tasking is stated to run "... concurrently with the GAGR Pilot..." Should the pricing for this tasking be included within our CLIN 1 GAGR pricing? Please advise.

RESPONSE - Yes. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 28

Can we propose an alternate CLIN structure for the price proposal?

RESPONSE - No.

QUESTION 29

Reference: Attachment 1 – Statement of Work. Section 4

The second pricing table contains two columns with the header "estimated hours". What is the purpose of the second?

RESPONSE - See revised Attachment 1, Section 4 for correction in Amendment 0001.

QUESTION 30

Reference: Attachment 1 – Statement of Work. Section 4

Contains a response table with two "Estimated Hours" Columns. What should be presented in the additional column?

RESPONSE - See response in question 29 above.

QUESTION 31

Reference: Section 4: Pricing

The second pricing table contains two columns with the header "Estimated Hours". What is the purpose of the second?

RESPONSE - See response in question 29 above.

QUESTION 32

Reference: Section 4: Pricing

The House desires one quote to be a "time and materials contract, with a no-to-exceed ceiling". It is unclear how to show the two time and materials values on the pricing table (1 – anticipated time and materials; 2 – not-to-exceed ceiling amount for time and materials).

RESPONSE - Please provide only a total not-to-exceed dollar amount. This amount should include estimated amounts for both time and materials.

QUESTION 33

During the GAGR, it may be discovered that the offeror's proposed approach for satisfying a House requirement may not be the desired approach of the House and therefore must be modified. Given that the initial award is for CLIN 1 only and that the House reserves the right to (1) cancel, or rescind, (2) re-execute (3) re-compete individual CLINs, it is assumed that the offeror can modify the firm fixed price quote for material changes in scope. Please confirm.

RESPONSE - Any time a contractor believes they are being requested to perform work out side of contract scope; they need to bring it to the attention of the COR and CO for resolution.

QUESTION 34

The House has asked for a fixed price for all CLINs. The requirements for some CLIN, specifically CLINS 9 and above as per section 3.2, are not fully defined. Can the House either waive the requirement for a fixed price on these CLINs or provide additional guidance as to the anticipated scope of these activities?

RESPONSE - No.

QUESTION 35

Reference: Section 4

Please clarify the House's expectations regarding the desire to receive pricing based on not-to-exceed ceiling and a second quote based on a firm fixed price contract. When would the House expect that the offeror's proposed pricing would be different? Shouldn't this be an optional choice, pending detailed analysis?

RESPONSE - The determination of proposed pricing is up to each offeror. Each offeror must submit both fixed price and not to exceed pricing for each CLIN.

QUESTION 36

Reference: Section 5

Section 5 Instructs the Offeror to separate the cost of implementing into a price for implementing fully compliant requirements, and the incremental cost to customize those that are not fully compliant. Section 4 doesn't indicate how the House would like the Offeror to separate out these costs within the existing pricing structure. Please advise.

RESPONSE - Amendment 0001 replaces Attachment 1 in its entirety, please review for revisions.

QUESTION 37

Reference: RFP, Page 2, Cost Table.

Text below table states "The results of the responses and orals will be an evaluation to select the software that best meets the needs of the House." This RFP pertains to the acquisition of FSR Systems Integration Services so RFP text appears inconsistent.

Should the RFP wording be modified to reflect "Systems Integration Services" vice "software"?

RESPONSE - The House has replaced the word "SOFTWARE" with "SYSTEM INTEGRATOR" in Amendment 0001.

QUESTION 38

Reference: 7.2.3

Section contains the sentence '... including, but limited to the following...' Should this be, 'including, but NOT limited to, the following....?'

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 39

Reference: Section E.2, Failure to Perform and Section F.5, Liquidated Damages – both reference Section F, HC 6.016, Payment for Non-performance, which is not incorporated in the RFP.

Can the House provide HC 6.016 for review?

RESPONSE - Yes. Amendment 0001 makes a pen and ink change to reflect changing "HC.6.016" to read "HC.6.009", and add the respective Payment for Non-Performance clause into the solicitation.

QUESTION 40

Reference: E.2 a – Refers to Section F, HC.6.016

Refers to Section F, HC.6.016. This does not appear in the document.

Furthermore, since the House wishes to utilize incentives and a performance based contract for this project, liquidated damages should not be necessary.

RESPONSE - See question 39 above for HC.6.016 response. Clause F.5, Liquidated Damages will remain.

QUESTION 41

Reference: Section G.5, Key Personnel, page 15

The language suggests that no substitution of key personnel is allowed except for illness, death or termination of employment. Typically, key personnel clauses require a stated period of time in which no substitutions are permitted after which substitutions are allowed subject to CO's review of qualifications.

Would the government consider revising this provision to reflect an initial period of one year?

RESPONSE – No.

QUESTION 42

Reference: H.9 Data Ownership/Transfer Access

The House states that "The House and contractor agree that all data procured under this contract...shall remain the exclusive property of and in the exclusive control of the House." Please include a definition of "data" in this context. The House is requesting a COTS solution. If any part of the COTS product is considered to be data, the software vendors may object to our providing products under the terms of this agreement.

RESPONSE - Data refers to House reference and transaction generated data (e.g. names, addresses, and vendor payments). COTS software is not data and is therefore not covered by this wording.

QUESTION 43

Reference: Section H.9, Data Ownership/Transfer/Access –

Contractor assumes that data, in this context, is the financial data generated by and processed through the system and not the COTS system itself. Please confirm.

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 44

Reference: Section 7.1.4, Federal Client List, Page 38- This requirement seems overly broad particularly given the nature of the companies, who may be expected to response.

Would the government consider narrowing the list to Federal clients with similar projects?

RESPONSE - Yes. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1. The request for the Federal Client list has been changed to request "Federal Clients for engagements of a similar scope".

QUESTION 45

Reference: Section 7.1.4 – Federal Client List

Our company has a large federal practice with thousands of professionals focused on the federal government. It would be impossible to list all current clients and describe the nature of those engagements. Furthermore, it is our policy not to release client contact information without specific permission to do so. Can this requirement be satisfied with a limited (5-10) number of representative clients?

RESPONSE - Yes. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 46

Reference: RFP Attachment 1, Section 2.2.5 *Interfaces*, Page 16.

Bullet number 2 concerns Staff Payroll. Please identify which payroll system the House uses currently and if there are any plans to transition to another payroll system in the future.

RESPONSE - The House currently has a custom mainframe based payroll system. The interface between this system and the core financial system contains gross pay records at the individual employee level once per pay period, which is currently once per month. The actual payroll disbursements occur in the payroll system so that the interface transactions only impact the general ledger. This system is scheduled to be replaced by Lawson payroll by December, 2004. The new payroll system will continue to pass payroll records at the individual employee level once per pay period. In addition, the actual payroll disbursements will continue to be processed by Lawson. Representatives from the financial system replacement project will be involved in the development of the new interface between Lawson and FFS and the financial system replacement project will have the documentation associated with this effort, including the detailed design and the user acceptance test scripts. Interface specifications are currently being developed between Lawson and FFS to include gross payroll, withholdings and government contributions, and disbursements associated with specific withholding and contribution categories.

QUESTION 47

Reference: Section 2.2.5 *Interfaces*, Page 16.

Are the data elements of the different interfaces (in Section 2.2.5) documented (e.g., Interface Design Document)?

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 48

Reference: Section 2.2.6

What security features and/or protocols are used to secure data across Communication Data Network (CDN) and the WAN (refer to Section 2.2.6)?

RESPONSE - The House infrastructure can support any of the standard security protocols, such as SSLv3/TLSv1, SSH2, and IPv6. However, the House will not release specific information regarding what is currently employed due to security considerations.

QUESTION 49

Reference: pg 45, 7.3.6 Conversion

Which 3 main legacy applications are within scope? Four are listed. (FFS, PD, FAIMS and FMS)

RESPONSE - All four systems are within scope. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 50

Reference: Section 2.2.3, 2.2.2, 2.2.4 and 2.3

Please clarify the House's expectations regarding the Work Order Management (WOM) System. The intro paragraph of Section 2.2.3 indicates that it will be replaced by FSR, but Section 2.3 indicates otherwise. Additionally, the functionality

doesn't appear to be covered in Section 2.2.2 and the table in Section 2.2.4 doesn't align it with any CLIN, further indicating that it is out of scope.

RESPONSE - The work order management system is not part of the FSR, however, there are certain work order requirements (as detailed in the Requirement Matrix, particularly in the Asset and Inventory areas) that are within scope. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 51

Reference: Section 2.3, Section 2.2.3

Section 2.3 says that the Work Order Management System is not part of the FSR but Section 2.2.3 indicates that it is. Please clarify.

RESPONSE - See response to question 50 above.

QUESTION 52

How will work orders be scheduled and tracked if not associated with any of the current CLIN structures (in table of Section 2.2.4)?

RESPONSE - See response to question 50 above.

QUESTION 53

Is the Work Order Management System and its data to be "decommissioned" without any conversion, migration and/or transformation? Please clarify.

RESPONSE - See response to question 50 above.

QUESTION 54

Reference: Section 2.2.3

Please clarify the House's expectations regarding FAIMS. The intro paragraph indicates that it will be replaced by FSR, but the table states that "it is planned that the inventory module and additional custom functionality will be incorporated into FAIMS".

RESPONSE - Currently House inventory functionality is in the FMS mainframe system. While the initial intent of the FAIMS project was to include inventory management there has been significant delays in the FAIMS project. Given these delays the House may choose to reconsider this interim implementation effort. The ultimate decision on whether to proceed with this interim implementation will depend on multiple factors including the viability of the legacy inventory system during the time anticipated to implement inventory management in the financial system replacement project.

QUESTION 55

Reference: Page 9, Section 2.2.1

What is the scope of data migration with respect to stored attachments?

RESPONSE - There are no stored attachments for data migration in FFS or FMS. Oracle fixed assets has some large text fields internal to the database, but no file attachments for conversion. Procurement Desktop has both Word and Excel attachments associated with solicitations, contracts, and purchase orders. These will need to be migrated along with any associated converted transactions.

QUESTION 56

Will the house please extend the due date by one week?

RESPONSE - The due date is extended to Monday, May 24, 2004.

QUESTION 57

Do you foresee any small business set-asides with the proposal?
Are there any vehicles for teaming or partnering?

RESPONSE - No. Prime contractors may team or partner as they deem necessary and full disclosure must be made in the offer to the House.

QUESTION 58

Is there a small business component to the RFP? (i.e. Are prime contractors required to have a certain percentage of small business in their team composition?)

RESPONSE - See response to question 57 above.

QUESTION 59

Reference: Place of Performance

F.6 says the Place of Performance is the House buildings. Section 7.1.1 talks about the vendor supplying facilities. Is this for the Pilot only? Please address the apparent inconsistency.

RESPONSE - The House anticipates that the Pilot staged development; test and "pilot" production environments will be hosted on the vendor infrastructure with internet or remote access to the application from the House. Most of the implementation efforts will occur on House property, but it is anticipated that some efforts may need to be performed at the vendor facility.

QUESTION 60

By what date does the House want complete lists of questions on the RFP?

RESPONSE - No deadline. However, the House reserves the right not to respond to questions not received in a timely manner to the solicitation closing date and time.

QUESTION 61

Reference: RFP Appendix, Page 41, Section 1 7.2.1 Program Management Methodology

Rational tools – Which Rational products and versions will the House be using during the timeframe of this project?
Can the integrator use the House's license for the Rational products or is the integrator to provide their own license?

RESPONSE - The House has 2 floating licenses for Team Unifying Platform and Rational Robot installed at the House. The Integrator may use these licenses during the integration efforts on House property.

QUESTION 62

Reference: Section 7.2.1

Will the House provide Rational licenses for use by the contractor or will the contractor need to use its own or procure such licenses?

RESPONSE - See response to question 61 above.

QUESTION 63

Reference: Section L2

Are any signatures required with the submitted responses?

If any signatures are required, can those documents be submitted in PDF format?

RESPONSE - Yes and Yes.

QUESTION 64

Reference: Section L3

Acknowledgement of Amendments – since the submission of the response is via e-mail can provisions be made to acknowledge amendments via e-mail as well.

RESPONSE - Yes.

QUESTION 65

Reference: Section M.1 Evaluation Factors for Award

Can the House provide some weighting as to the relative importance of one evaluation criteria over another so that vendors can have some guidance as to the relative importance of these factors to the House?

RESPONSE - All evaluation criteria are of equal importance.

QUESTION 66

General – Can the House provide language for the contractor to request the rejection of a particular IV&V contractor for reasonable cause (i.e. they are competitors of the contractor or would not be objective for a particular reason)?

RESPONSE - No.

QUESTION 67

Reference: Section 3.1

References the IV&V contractor and the review of the IV&V being critical to House Acceptance.

Question: Is the IV&V contractor reviewing on a "not to interfere" basis with the integrator? Or will the integrator need to be available to "walk the IV&V contractor through the system"?

RESPONSE – Yes. It is not the responsibility of the integrator to train the IV&V contractor on the software solution. Communication and collaboration will be facilitated by the House.

QUESTION 68

Reference: Attachment 1 – Statement of Work, Section 2.2.3 – Table 2.2.4

The CLIN line numbering does not match the CLIN numbering on the top row of the table in section 3.2. Which is correct?

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 69

Reference: Attachment 1 – Table 2.2.4

Function to System Mapping, specifically the CLIN numbering does not match the CLIN numbers in the table in Section 3.2

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 70

Most sections of the RFP refer to CLIN 1 as the GAGR and CLIN 2 as the GL, AP, AR, Budget and Cost modules. However, in section 2.2.4, the GAGR does not appear, and CLIN 1 refers to the GL, AP, AR, Budget, and Cost modules. Please clarify the CLIN structure as there are differences between CLINs.

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 71

Reference: RFP 2.2.4 – Function to system Mapping, Page 14

CLIN 1 is a gap analysis/resolution and pilot. Based upon the table mapping in 2.2.4, are the only aspects of the GAP analysis/resolution and pilot the five applications/functions identified as CLIN 1 in the table in this section (i.e., GL, Budget, Cost, AP, AR)?

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1. The GAGR Pilot will include Phase I functions, so the CLINs included in the pilot will depend on the offer's phasing strategy. See Section 3.3.8 of revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 72

Reference: Section 3.3.8 Initial Award and Pilot

The House states “Based on the results of the pilot, the House reserves the right to potentially (1) cancel or rescind the contract award, (2) re-execute the pilot, (3) re-compete the systems integration RFP and (4) in the case it is discovered that the software is deficient, re-compete the combined software selection RFQ and the systems integration RFP”. How will the House measure the success or failure of the pilot? Please verify that the contractor will be paid in the case of a deficiency in the software since the House has selected the software.

RESPONSE – There are two major factors in the evaluation of the pilot: the software meets the needs of the House and the integrator has the ability to implement the system. The integrator will not be held accountable in the case of a deficiency in the COTS software.

QUESTION 73

Reference: Section 5

Should the paragraph that starts with Customization have a bullet in front of it? Are there three definitions (Customization, Extension and Configuration) or is the overall definition Customization with two separate sub-areas of Customization – Extension and Configuration.

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 74

Reference: Section 5.1

The second paragraph states that “Potential Offerors must specify, by line item, the costing elements of the proposed solution. The categories for Level of Effort (LOE) are Low (less than 100 hours), Medium (100 to 200 hours) and High (Over 200 hours), if over 200 hours please break down the hours in detail to low or medium values.” These three levels do not match the column headers on the compliance matrix (Minor, Substantial and Bolt-on of 3rd Party Product). Can the House provide guidance (and possibly an example) on how the Compliance Matrix is to be completed? Also what is meant by the breakdown of over 200 hours?

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1 and Attachment 2.

QUESTION 75

Reference: Attachment 2 – Compliance Matrix

General – The format of each line item requirement in the Compliance Matrix allows three columns for compliance assessment and three columns for level of effort. We feel that it would be valuable to detail the applicable module and available functionality for each requirement. Can we expand the format to allow for additional columns of text?

RESPONSE - No.

QUESTION 76

Reference: Section H.3

Background Checks: Are DoD or other clearances acceptable/transferrable?

RESPONSE - All House background checks must be performed by the U.S. Capitol Police. If security clearances are necessary for any work then active clearances are transferable.

QUESTION 77

Reference: Section 2.3 Concurrent Initiatives

Strategic initiatives proposal 7, describes a concurrent effort to "develop a structured Business Process Improvement Program that facilitates continuous.....of core business processes..."

Question: With the implementation of a new solution, there will be required changes to business processes to support/adhere to best practices within the software solution. Will these process changes be worked in tandem? Or will one effort lead the other?

RESPONSE - In coordination with the Strategic Initiative Proposal 7, Business Process Improvement initiative, the FSR will lead the process changes relevant to the functionality of the system being delivered during each phase of the project.

QUESTION 78

Are all of the current/target business processes documented? Where are the gaps in their documentation of processes and policies?

RESPONSE - The majority of financial processes are documented. Note that The House intends to provide the integrator with IDEF models, process models, and desk procedures for the majority of House process within scope for this project.

QUESTION 79

Reference: Section 3.3.5

Review Process - provides information with regards to the Oral proposal. The third bullet on page 26, states that the presentation will consist of "....detail of the following scenarios as if they were to be demonstrated with the software".

Question: What scenarios are being referenced? And is the House expecting screen shots in the presentation?

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 80

Reference: Section 3.1

Is the development of the plan expected at the time of negotiation for each CLIN? (See last paragraph in Section 3.1.)

RESPONSE - There is no reference to "plan" in the last paragraph of Section 3.1, However, the House expects each Potential Offeror to provide their proposed implementation plan (by phase or groups of CLINs as described in Section 3.2), which should include milestones, deliverables, and approval/sign-off processes and checkpoints. Modifications to the vendor's implementation plan may be made during final contract negotiations.

QUESTION 81

Reference: Section 6.1.11

Continuity of Operations Plan - Section references IT Backup and Recovery plan in 6.1.8. However, 6.1.8 Development Environment, however, these plans are not referenced here.

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

QUESTION 82

Reference: Section 7.3

Section instructs Offeror to trace or reference House SDLC methodology and policy to implementation activities. Is that related to the deliverable descriptions or to the remaining sub-sections 7.3.1 - 7.3.11?

RESPONSE – See Amendment 0001 Attachment 4. This attachment may be downloaded from web site <http://www.house.gov/cao-opp/currentsol.htm>

QUESTION 83

Would the House consider having the system hosted by someone else at an alternate location?

RESPONSE - No. The pilot must be hosted by the integrator. See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1, Section 3.3.8.

QUESTION 84

Do we have to propose the disaster recovery site or does the House already have one? The expectation states "near real time" for replication of the instances.

RESPONSE - The house has a disaster recovery site.

QUESTION 85

What system (if any) currently provides the travel management function (refer to Section 2.2.4)? Explain the current processes for request, approval and provision of travel resources.

RESPONSE - The House does not currently have a travel system in place. A feasibility study with respect to a travel system is underway at this time.

QUESTION 86

Section 3.2, page 21 of the RFP states: "Please note we are requesting from the Potential Offerors their recommendation, based on their past experience, of an implementation strategy which most effectively and efficiently delivers functionality with minimal impact and provides the best value to the House." In light of this focus on best value to the Government and innovative approaches, please clarify how prospective integrators can propose innovative approaches for fully addressing the requirements, while remaining compliant with the RFP. For example, how should the offeror's response be presented if the recommended solution requires modification of the software vendor's original responses to the requirements matrices in Section J Attachment 2? In addition to the requirements matrices, what constraints might there be on pricing?

RESPONSE - See Amendment 0001 revised Attachment 1.

Question 87

Reference: RFP, Section M.1 Evaluation Factors for Award, Page 28.

Question: Orals instructions includes "... and detail of the following scenarios as if they were to be demonstrated with the software." The scenario details appear to be missing from the RFP. When will the scenario details be released to the Offerors so they can properly prepare for Orals? Please advise.

RESPONSE - This has been revised see Amendment 0001.